1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
3		
4 5	State of Arizona, ex rel. Kristin K. Mayes	
6	Attorney General et al.	
7	Attorney General et al.	
8	Plaintiffs)	
9	1 laminis	
10	v.	Case No. 4:23-cv-00233-EJM
11) · ·	Cuse 110. 11.23 ev 00233 E0111
12	Michael D. Lansky, LLC, dba	
13	Avid Telecom, an Arizona	
14	Limited Liability Company;	
15		
16	Michel D. Lansky, individually	
17	As a Member/Manager/Chief)	
18	Executive Officer of Michael D.	
19	Lansky, LLC dba Avid Telecom;	
20	and)	
21)	
22	Stacey S. Reeves, individually as)	
23	a Manager/Vice President of)	
24	Michael D. Lansky LLC dba	
25	Avid Telecom	
26)	
27	Defendants.	
28		
29	IDDODOCED	ODDED
30 31	[PROPOSED]	ORDER
32	Having considered the Motion to Revise, opposition and reply pleadings, the	
32	Traving considered the Motion to Revise,	opposition and reply pleadings, the
33	Scheduling Order is hereby revised to provide as follows:	
34	a. Defendants shall be allowed to prop	ound both written discovery on all
35	Plaintiffs;	
36	b. Defendants shall be allowed to propour	nd oral discovery on <i>all</i> 49 Plaintiffs
		·
37	c. The limits on written discovery shall be revised such that each party may	
38	propound up to twenty-five (25) interro	ogatories on each other named party.

d. In terms of party depositions, the FRCP limit on depositions shall be revised such that Defendants may take a single deposition of each named Plaintiff and Plaintiffs may take the deposition of each named Defendant. e. Plaintiffs, as a group, and Defendants, as a group, shall each be allowed up to 25 non-party depositions. Dated: